

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE MEJIA,
Plaintiff,

v.

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,
Defendant.

Case No. 21-cv-01351-HSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
APPOINT COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. No. 11

Plaintiff requests that the Court appoint him *pro bono* counsel because he is unable to afford counsel and believes that a lawyer could assist him in a settlement conference. Dkt. No. 11. He has previously retained counsel but can no longer afford to do. *Id.* Plaintiff initially filed his complaint in California state court, and it does not appear that he applied to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Dkt. No. 1-1.

“Generally, a person has no right to counsel in civil actions.” *See Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009). However, under this district’s General Order No. 25, the Court may appoint *pro bono* counsel if the “litigant’s claims are cognizable and the factual and legal issues warrant proper presentation to the Court with the assistance of an attorney.” At this early stage in the litigation, Plaintiff has thus far sufficiently articulated his claims *pro se*, the issues do not appear to be unduly complex, and it is unclear if this case will proceed to trial. Accordingly, the Court finds that the factual and legal issues do not warrant appointment of *pro bono* counsel, and Plaintiff’s request for appointment of counsel is **DENIED** without prejudice to the Court’s

//


//

//

1 *sua sponte* referral for consideration of the appointment of *pro bono* counsel should circumstances
2 warrant.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: 3/18/2021

6 
7 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California